

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6 and 7 are now in this application. Claim 1 is amended. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 6 and 7 are allowed. As noted below, claim 1 is amended herein to include a combination of elements not taught or suggested by the references cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, all claims of this application are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iuchi et al. '622 in view of Kuroda '169 and Lejeune '800.

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Claim 1 is amended herein to include a combination of elements directed to a pneumatic tire, a pair of bead portions each provided therein with a single bead core made of windings of at least one wire,

a carcass including a single radial ply of cords extending between the bead portions and turned up around the bead core from the axially inside to the outside of the tire to form a pair of turnup portions and a main portion therebetween,

each said turnup portion extending radially outwardly beyond the radially outer end of the bead apex and adjoining the main portion to form an adjoining region.

Support for single bead core 6, a carcass 5 including a single radial ply of cords 7, and turnup portion 5B extending radially outwardly beyond the radially outer end of the bead apex 9

and adjoining the main portion 5A to form an adjoining region S, can be found in the specification, and are illustrated in Fig. 1.

By contrast, Kuroda merely discloses double bead cores, and Iuchi et al. merely disclose a bias ply tire. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that no combination of Kuroda and Iuchi et al. teaches or suggests the novel combination of elements set forth in claim 1 of the present invention. Further, Lejeune fails to make up for the deficiencies of Kuroda and Iuchi et al.

Claims 6 and 7 are allowed. Therefore all claims of the present application are in condition for allowance.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration of the rejections of record is respectfully requested and any early notice of allowance is earnest solicited.

Conclusion

The stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance. However, if there are any remaining issues, the Examiner is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully request a three-month extension of time in which to file this reply. A check for \$930 is attached.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Joseph A. Kolasch, #22,463

0239-0608P

Attachments

JAK:CTT:jls



P. O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000